

REMARKS

Claims 28-30 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claim 28, and have canceled claims 1-27 and 31-34. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Cancellation of Non-Elected Species

Applicants have canceled claims 1-27 and 31-34, which are directed toward non-elected species. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims 1-27 and 31-34 in one or more timely filed divisional applications.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Meade II et al.* (“*Meade*”) (US 2003/0137685 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Meade* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claim 28, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended independent claim 28 to clarify that the “process data” is subject to the process, and to specify that the processing module executes the process “in exchange for the amount of money information required for the processing.” Support for the changes to claim 28 can be found in Applicants’ specification (see, for example, Paragraphs [0017], [0035], and [0056]).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s characterization of the *Meade* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 28. In particular, in support of the anticipation rejection, the Examiner asserts that the hard copy cost recovery system 10 (referred to as “tracking apparatus 10” in the disclosed embodiment) of *Meade* corresponds to the “device” defined in claim 28 (see the Office Action at page 3). The device defined in present claim 28 is for executing a process, e.g., executing a print job with a printer. In contrast, the tracking apparatus 10 shown in the *Meade* reference is an entire system, which

includes an image forming device 12 within a local area network (LAN) environment 14 to which one or more client personal computers (PCs) are connected.

Further, the Examiner asserts that “usage information 36” shown in the *Meade* reference corresponds to the “money information” recited in claim 28 (see the Office Action at page 4). However, *Meade*’s “usage information 36” includes cost information for the total page area 44 and toner coverage 48 (see Paragraph [0036] of the *Meade* reference). The processing circuitry 38 of image forming device 12 computes the total page area 44 and toner coverage 48 as a page area cost associated with generating a print job, and also by counting the pixel coverage used to generate the print job, when the print job is transmitted to the image forming device (see Paragraph [0039] of the *Meade* reference). Thus, *Meade*’s “usage information” represents *the cost for an individual print job* (see Paragraph [0028] of the *Meade* reference), which should not be considered to be the same as the “money information” specified in the claimed subject matter. In this regard, Applicants note that the consumption by the print job in the *Meade* reference is not deducted from the “usage information.” As such, *Meade*’s “usage information” is not used in the same manner as the claimed “money information” is used.

Still further, the Examiner asserts that the “processing circuitry 38” of *Meade* corresponds to the “processing module” defined in claim 28. As specified in present claim 28, the processing module executes the process “in exchange for the amount of money information required for the processing.” The processing circuitry 38 of *Meade* does not execute any process in exchange for the amount of money information required for the processing, as in the presently claimed subject matter.

Finally, with regard to the Examiner’s characterization of the *Meade* reference relative to the claimed “decision module,” the portion of the *Meade* reference relied upon by the Examiner, i.e., Paragraph [0049], does not provide support for the anticipation rejection. In

particular, Paragraph [0049] of the *Meade* reference does not describe comparing the “amount of money information required for processing the process data” and the “amount of money information held in the holding module,” as specified in the presently claimed subject matter. Moreover, with regard to the feature of causing the processing module to execute the process, *Meade*’s MFP 24 does not execute any process in exchange for the amount of money information required for the processing, as specified in present claim 28.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Meade* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claim 28.

Accordingly, independent claim 28, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Meade*. Claims 29 and 30, each of which depends from claim 28, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Meade* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 28.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 28-30, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any additional fees are due in

Application No. 10/789,416
Amendment dated October 30, 2008
Response to Office Action mailed June 30, 2008

connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP080).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920